

Further, Figure 4 has not been accurately described in the Restriction Requirement. For example, Figure 4 does not show any searching triggered by touching a display. Nor does any claim require searching for an entertainment terminal that is triggered by touching a display. Nevertheless, searching for the species of Figure 4 as described in the Restriction Requirement would not add any meaningful searching burden to the Examiner.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

An interview with Examiner Perez was held via telephone on February 10, 2010. The species of Figure 3 and Figure 4 were discussed. The Examiner stated that the species of Figure 3 identified in the Restriction Requirement would relate to claims 25-39 and that the species identified in the Restriction Requirement as being related to Figure 4 would relate to claim 40. During the interview, Examiner Perez also tried to explain to the undersigned how claim 40 related to the species shown in Figure 4 and how claims 25-39 related to the species of Figure 3.

In view of the conversation held with Examiner Perez, applicant has made the above mentioned election with traverse of the species identified in the Restriction Requirement as being shown in Figure 3. Based on the interview, the undersigned believes that claims 25-39 are within the species of Figure 3.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 18, 2010

/Ralph G. Fischer/

Ralph G. Fischer
Registration No. 55,179
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
One Oxford Centre
301 Grant Street, 20th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1410
(412) 392-2121

Attorney for Applicant